

SALT LAKE VALLEY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER

OPERATIONS BOARD MEETING *September 14, 2017 – Meeting Minutes* **VECC Board Room - 5360 S Ridge Village Drive** **West Valley City**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chief Bryan Robert, Draper
Chief Marc McElreath, West Jordan
Chief Clint Smith, Draper
Chief Andy Butler, South Jordan
Chief Gil Rodriguez, Murray
B/C Lee Ascarte, UFA
Chief Robby Russo, Cottonwood Heights
Chief Doug Diamond, West Jordan
Chief Craig Burnett, Murray
Chief Shane Hudson, UPD
Chief Colleen Nolen, West Valley City
Chief John Evans, West Valley City
Chief Jeff Carr, South Jordan

OTHERS PRESENT: Brett Heddlesten, PD Users
Andrew Haygood, TS Users
Dave Shopay, West Valley City
Warren James, Contractor
John I. Morgan, VECC Executive Director
Jeff Monson, HR Manager
Mark Whetsel, TS Manager
Gigi Smith, PD Manager
Beth Todd, FD Manager
Leslie Devey, QA Supervisor
Chris Dunn, QA Supervisor
Ambir Widdison, Operations Assistant
Andrea Partridge, Admin. Manager

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion –

. . . by Chief Craig Burnett; to approve the minutes of the June 8, 2017 Board of Operations meeting; seconded by Chief Clint Smith; the motion passed unanimously.

Motion –

. . . by Chief Marc McElreath; to approve the minutes of the August 16, 2017 Joint Board of Operations/Board of Trustee meeting; seconded by Chief Gil Rodriguez; the motion carried unanimously.

USER COMMITTEE REPORTS

Fire and Emergency Medical Report

Beth Todd reported that in the EMD/EFD Dispatch Review Committee meeting, they discussed entrapment-type calls. There were two different ways that they could be coded; public assist or extrication/entrapment. If the extrication/entrapment protocol is chosen, it gets an engine and ambulance response. If it's a public assist, it only gets an engine. After discussion, the users preferred to go with a public assist and then they will advise if an ambulance is necessary. They also went through and discussed the 33 protocol, which will be discussed later in this meeting. The 10600 S I-15 interchange and closure of the bridge for a month was discussed. Beth gave an update on the US Digital, which will be reviewed later as well. The CAD was updated and Beth mentioned that Joe Borgione, who was VECC's GIS person, had resigned as of the end of last month. We are searching for a new GIS person and hope to get them in place pretty soon. Joe has agreed to help transition them once we bring them on board. The mobile pilot started last week and initially there were a few bumps in the road but as they have gone through each day, it's gotten a little bit better. Yesterday went very smooth as far as information and statuses being transferred from the mobile to the CAD system. On the Zetron, the chips are in and we let them know we would be doing the municipal and VHF/UHF panels last Friday. Once they went through and got this completed, there were still a few stations that there were issues with. Fatpot and Mike are

in here today working with Lin and trying to get those last few stations working. Warren James advised them that the RFP for station 92 is in and they hope to get that decision soon.

Law Enforcement Report

Britt Heddlesten reported that they discussed dispatching sexual assault codes. Some of the dispatchers were having difficulty in deciding whether to say words like "sexual assault" over the radio. It was discussed that whether they say "sexual assault" or "code-R", there is nothing wrong with speaking it over the radio. They moved on to complainant name spelling and reminded the CT's and Dispatchers to verify the spelling of names when they are taking the call, but it is also the responsibility of the officer when they arrive at the call not to just go off what's been given, but to verify it as well. There have been two new event codes that have been added; a transient code, for calls for service, and a fire assist animal control code. On the watch commander logs, Gigi has requested that she receive these logs from agencies that do these. If this is approved through this group, she would like to distribute them to the dispatchers so they are up to speed on what's happening in the cities they dispatch on. They discussed that Utah has started putting up ramp identification signs on the North Temple and Bangerter Hwy areas on the transition ramps. They are basically signage about once every tenth of a mile; it will say for example, 300.1 and it will have letter designators on there. If someone is stuck on that ramp, they will be able to call in and identify where they're at. They are putting out an app also, but it is still very young in its stages at this point and they will appear on most of the major interchanges in the next while. They also discussed the 10600 South closures. The Send protocol was updated. The academy is putting together a short roll-call video to be distributed out and Gigi has ordered small pocket cards for the officers so they can give the proper information when they request medical. Gigi explained the send protocol further. It was decided that dispatchers would not launch Pro-Qa, but rather they will just have the officer answer seven very quick questions; chief complaint, age, conscious, breathing, chest pain present, severe bleeding and then which type of response is requested. The pocket cards will give these instructions. They will also be asking the dispatchers that if the officer doesn't give this information, to quickly ask them this information. This way Fire will know and be able to send the correct units to respond. The pocket cards have arrived, but the videos initially were an hour long, which Gigi told the Academy that was too long. They are going back to shorten it to 5-15 minutes, and once they are completed they'll let Gigi know and she will forward them. They moved from this into a Chair re-election. Britt was elected at the last meeting but he is being transferred back to patrol and Mike Obrey with Murray has been elected as the new Chairman. They discussed frauds again and stressed the fact that they should not be telling victims who call in that they need to call each individual agency, giving them the runaround. Each agency is handling this a little bit differently and some were still telling the individual they would have to call back in, so they were just clarifying again. On the EPD DRC meetings, it was decided to hold these quarterly versus monthly. The agenda was just very small and so they decided to hold them less frequently.

Tech Services Report

Andrew Haygood reported that there were some questions on Hexagon. On bug reports and issues that end users are having, they wanted to know if there was a way for them to contact Hexagon for this. John is trying to get Hexagon to start attending these monthly meetings so that these questions can be answered. Corbin w/ SLCounty had questions with network traffic saturation on everyone's network. The way that CAD operates for those Centers, there were some issues that got better during the pilot program and SLC's connection is what caused most problems, but they have been resolved. Draper had a question as to why the traffic going through is not encrypted. Jake Sorenson had questions as to why the Hexagon installer is so hard to use. Corey has created a power strip which makes this easier, but some people want to know why this hasn't been addressed by Hexagon. Hopefully with them attending the monthly meetings, these questions will be answered.

EMD/EPD Dispatch Review Committee Discussion

Beth mentioned that they discussed Interfacility Transport, protocol 33. There have been issues with this, particularly final coding and the definitions that VECC has, per policy. The difficulty is even if the caller requests an ALS response, it's still coding at the end as a BLS response. We have been discussing different protocols, and we have Ivan Whittaker on a webex go through and explain the improvements in the 37 protocol as well as the issues with 33, and they have created 45, 46 and 47. Ivan went through and did a demonstration of the 45-47 protocols and then answered some questions. After he disconnected, the Doctor's biggest question was what is the problem we are trying to solve. The new protocols seem to be a lot more confusing and difficult than the current one we are using. Beth explained the final coding problem and that there is a lack of clarification on one of the questions as to why the patient is being transported. Beth has requested that this committee continue to look and compare the different protocols and come up with a recommendation as to what is the best over-all for the customers. It may be to just continue to use the 33 protocol. In the mean time, Beth requested from the group as well as discussing in the Fire users to create a new draft policy to resolve some of the final coding issues on a temporary basis. What this does is instruct the Call Takers that they need to ask the

clarifying question as to why they are being transported and as well, it tells them if it's an ALS response, how to achieve that Charlie response level rather than the alpha. Beth has requested if anyone gets comments or suggestions back on that particular protocol by September 25th, she will take it back to the DRC meeting and have them come up with a final recommendation to take to Users and then bring back to this Board next month. Marc McElreath asked if the Board voted to use the 33 protocol, which they did, and call takers are not deviating from this, we are just trying to enhance the protocol. John commented that with Ivan coming out to do a presentation, we wanted to be sure we looked at every option. (Ivan Whittaker is the Medical Director for Pro-Qa.) Marc also asked what the Center's position was on being a beta site for those 3 new protocols, and Beth indicated that the beta is already been in progress and is almost done, and VECC didn't participate in it. John commented that the reason Ivan came in because, as you know, there have been some allegations that we have been dispatching incorrectly, which has been taken to some legislative individuals, and John wanted to make sure we have done our due diligence and that we have looked at these things. Our position, as voted on by this body, is still to utilize protocol 33.

CAD/RMS/FBR/MPS PROJECT REPORT AND TECHNICAL DISCUSSION

John commented that one thing everyone will find in the shared Dropbox is the Hexagon status report. What this does is looks at the accomplishments and risks that we have going forward from the last meeting. He will bring it to the meeting each month. John asked everyone to take a look at it when they get an opportunity. There are individuals who attend the RMS meetings, which are every other Thursday. There has been good progress made. In looking at these reports, we have faced a number of challenges but we have also made a lot of accomplishments as well. For the past two weeks, we have been testing the MPS and while there initially were some connectivity problems, as of yesterday, there have been some very good success on both Police and Fire. After his meeting adjourns, John invited everyone to go into the Training Room where everything is set up to do some dispatching, some en-routes, arrives, closes and other things to see from both the dispatch and MPS screen. If there are any questions, please bring them to Chief Evans, Chief Diamond or John Morgan so they can be forwarded to Hexagon and the Project Manager.

FISCAL YEAR 2018 OPERATIONS PLANNING ISSUES

Administration

John mentioned that in the Joint Meeting last month, the Boards identified a number of topics that were our goal to get through over the next year. The first one coming up is the organizational Bylaws and the review of them. John displayed the Bylaws, which contains Bylaws for both Operations and Trustees. John included them together because this Operations Board is advisory to the Trustees and any changes that he thinks we start to make should have a recommendation from this Board to be taken to the Board of Trustees. When looking at the purpose of the Operations Board, does it encompass what this Operations Board should be doing to get to optimal-types of decisions that we need to make. John would like to define clearer which policies need to be changed or modified. In overseeing the day to day operations of the Center, how exactly does this Board want to do that and are there other reports, details and statistics they wish to see coming into this. John's goal is on a periodic basis to show the Board these and certainly on an annual basis look at call volume as it relates to member assessments. It relates to VECC's standing with the rest of the State now because that call volume is going to be money for us. The change in SB198 was that rather than have the distribution based on authorization by the municipalities; it is now a State fund and will be distributed by the call volume itself. Chief Roberts commented that one thing helpful for the Board is the User Groups that we have. They meet and discuss things and make recommendations to the Board, often times that are day-to-day operational type issues. John feels that the purpose of those User groups is to get down into the weeds. They have been expanded to include UHP, Salt Lake City and Sandy, and they are all active members of the User groups even though they aren't members of VECC. If we are going to have an effective day-to-day response, we need to have that interface and discussion by all agencies that we deal with on an ongoing basis. John asked if these reports were sufficient or if they wanted additional information.

On Policy development, this has always been a blurred line, as to which policies are the responsibility of the Trustees and the Operations Boards. The primary responsibility of the Trustees is to set a budget. This budget comes as a recommendation from this group here, but would also deal with this groups' determination of staffing and what our needs are. If we are looking at having a radio channel that is overburdened or one that is not so overburdened, staffing becomes an issue. We have to decide whether to hire more people, combine channels, or separate channels. John feels that this needs to be delved into more as we start developing those policies on where are we as far as employment and those things. Other policies we get to get down to the Operation, which is clearly a responsibility of the Operations Board, for example, responding to frauds. The recommendation comes from the User committee and that's how we deal with it. The protocols we utilize when looking at an interfacility transfer would be something John believes never needs to go to the Board of Trustees. If it did, he's not sure they would have the understanding to take a vote. Those types of policies would end here as a vote of

this group. John can modify both the Bylaws so that we reflect those kinds of things. Chief Roberts asked John if he was looking for some specific examples of day-to-day operation policies that he would like this group to be responsible for could it be left general, as they understand what it is. John feels it can be left as is unless there are particular things they wish to have added that clearly delineates the differences between the Operations and Trustees Boards. John would like to identify specifically which policies and resolutions they would adopt. Chief Roberts asked the Board if they felt comfortable with the language in "D" in the Bylaws with regards to Operations Board overseeing the day-to-day operations of VECC. John didn't feel like a motion was necessarily if it's being kept the same. The other thing John wanted to look at on memberships was that each member entity would appoint a representative to the Operations Board and they shall provide written endorsement of the appointment for each representative from each members Chief Exec. Officer, Chief Admin. Officer or Mayor to direct John to empanel the group. This is already in the Bylaws, but we haven't really been complying with this, if there are changes. If there is a change in leadership, this would require by both Interlocal and the Bylaws to have a Letter of Endorsement on who the representative and alternate representative is for each entity. John doesn't see a change here but more of an acknowledgement of the fact that this is already adopted in the Bylaws and we need to have this endorsement. Chief Diamond asked if the endorsement would need to change when the cities elect a new Mayor or hire a new City Manager. John commented that he felt that anything that has been adopted and officially sent to VECC, it remains until it's rescinded. John would expect if a new Mayor comes in, that he would get a letter that rescinds the appointment of an individual and the replacement of a primary and secondary.

In looking at membership on the Board of Trustees, that has always been related to the financial contributions that each entity has made. Entities like Taylorsville and Herriman, while they don't have their own Police and Fire departments, per se; they were making a financial contribution by authorizing the optional 9-1-1 fee. What was happening is that fee was sent from the Tax Commission directly to Taylorsville, who would then remit those funds to VECC. SB198 change that so no longer is that an authorized fee or tax that the cities adopt. It does make a difference because, essentially, those entities are not financially contributing to the overall funding of the VECC budget. They are in a number of different ways being charged an amount for dispatching. The question has to come up and we have to answer that question, who sits around the Trustees table. This may be something this Board wants to differ to the Trustees to come back and then have John take a look at. There is an argument that it is beneficial for representation to be at the table regardless of whether each has its own self-provided Police or Fire department. It ties in, however, to the weighted vote because the weighted vote was based on their contribution. In Taylorsville, for example, there is a very small amount because it was just that tax, and didn't include the member assessment, which gave them a fraction of a vote. In doing this, would they have a weighted vote still through UPD or would that reduce UPD's voting. It is a complex issue, one that needs to be discussed. John would suggest that the Board consider pushing it up to the Trustees and have them talk about it, unless there are feelings here. Chief McElreath asked if the cities that utilize UPD and UFA should be discussing this with them. If their vote is 100%, whether Taylorsville takes 25% or if and UPD takes the rest, they aren't getting any more vote, they are just splitting it up between cities. They could delegate their entire votes to UFA and UPD or UPD could invite them to come to the table as representing themselves.

In addition to the Bylaws, John added a paragraph which references the Interlocal Agreement. Paragraph 9 of the Interlocal says each member shall have one vote on the Board of Trustees and each member's vote shall be weighted. Then it goes on to talk about how that vote is weighted. All of these entities we are talking about that contract for service are currently members by Interlocal Agreement. This is where the discussion has to come in and do we redo the Interlocal Agreement or do we discuss with UPD and UFA on their preferences for dealing with these things. John feels it's beneficial for each community to sit at the table but how would we deal with the voting itself. Chief McElreath asked how the unincorporated cities get representation. John indicated that their representation is through the County, who is represented by Carlton Christensen and the Mayor's office. By the same formula used with the contribution from the County, about \$500k, they have always had a representative on the Board. This was reflected in a percentage vote. Now that this is not a funding source anymore, this is what brings up the question. The weighted votes are reviewed and examined once a year. John does this and forwards it to Andrea. In the past three years, there has only been one weighted vote, in the very beginning. After this, there has been no need to even look at the weighted votes because it's all been unanimous. John has heard and feels it could be a recommendation that he is directed to meet with UFA and UPD and talk about their contracts with them and then bring something back either here or to the Board of Trustees. Chief McElreath feels the Board of Trustees should make the decision.

Motion –

. . . by Chief Marc McElreath, to defer this discussion to the Board of Trustees; seconded by Chief Doug Diamond; the motion carried unanimously.

On the Member Assessment, John had made the recommendation that this be assigned to the Budget Committee or at the Operations direction, to another committee to start looking at it. There have been a number of recommendations over time and currently we take a look at all the calls volume in each entity, looking at a three-year rolling average and then taking this as a percent of the overall budget itself. In looking at some of the options available to us, some of the discussion has to be which calls are being put into calls for service and are they equitable amongst all agencies. This is probably the first step we need to take, but we'll need to look at data. Some of the alternatives that have been presented deviate from this a little bit, but number will need to be collected and look at what the impact will be. One option is that we look at just dispatched calls. From a PD side, this would mean that those that come in on 9-1-1 and that are dispatched, but would exclude those calls that are self-initiated. There needs to be in-depth discussion on this. John's recommendation at the Board's direction would be to defer this to the Budget Committee or to impanel a Committee to sit down and take a look at this.

Motion –

. . . by Chief Doug Diamond; to defer discussion of Member Assessments to a separate Committee; seconded by Chief John Evans; the motion carried unanimously.

John then requested to identify members of the Member Assessment Committee. Those who volunteered were Chief Marc McElreath, Chief Clint Smith, Chief Doug Diamond, Chief Craig Burnett, Chief Jeff Carr and Chief John Evans.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Fire Station Alerting Systems

Beth Todd reported that they have been looking at US Digital, which is also the Station Alerting System that SLC uses. The end goal is to have everyone on the same system so that we can dispatch and be a backup for other centers and have seamless dispatching no matter where the call comes from or which department it is. Beth has been gathering floor plans and there still are a few stations that haven't submitted them yet. These are just so that we can look to see where speakers might need to be placed as well as other equipment. In looking at the basic package, which VECC would purchase for each station, it would include the controller, receiver, 1 read out board, an interface, and a light relay switch, which would cost between \$10 - \$15k per station. John mentioned this would be subject to budget approval. One thing done with the 9-1-1 fees is put into a reserve account an additional \$900k, which would be an allocation from this reserve account, based upon the recommendation of this Board to the Board of Trustees who would amend the budget. Beth continued that part of these costs for VECC would also be the equipment that we need to place at VECC. We had Glen from SLC and Warren who went out and looked at station 73, and from what they could tell, the wiring and much of the hardware can be utilized and switched over to the new system. We would still need to have every station inspected to make sure that this would work, and see what kind of gaps there might be, but it looks favorable to be able to use a lot of the existing equipment. If it's a new station, new equipment would need to be installed and then anything above this basic package, if the agencies want more, they would have to handle the cost. Chief McElreath commented that the pricing Beth quoted was much different than what was in the bid sent out. The bid sent out had 3 reader boards per station and was almost \$11k in just labor per station. John commented that what Beth is quoting is for the equipment itself and then having us hire in addition to this an electrician that understands low-voltage and it would be the minimal amount for reader boards. They are saying 3 reader boards would be the minimum; however, it is something to be discussed. John mentioned a meeting yesterday out at station 2 in SLC, and he spoke with an installer there and asked what it took to become certified, and it's not a difficult process. We can find some electricians that understand the schematics and have them certified if we need to. Glen is also certified and he has the ability to do this, and SLC Fire has offered him to us to help Warren and go around to do the assessments. Chief McElreath thinks there should be another meeting with the Fire Chiefs to get more information. John believes this is the next step, to sit down with them and figure out everything and then get some a direction to go to the stations and assess them. Warren commented that something to consider is that US Digital has an ongoing annual maintenance fee and Zetron doesn't. Costs need to be looked at going forward. Beth will pull a meeting together to discuss this further.

Policy Project

Gigi Smith commented that as we go through our Policies and Procedures, if there are any priority policies for Operations that they wish us to address, please let either Gigi or Beth know. Otherwise, they are looking to overhaul each policy and procedure. They have found that over the years there have been policies and employees or supervisors are storing them everywhere so they can be accessed. Then there is a policy change, and those stored have not been updated. They realized it needed to be gone through and organized. Gigi, Beth, Jeff and Ambir are having meetings each few weeks and they are updating, editing and changing these policies, and mapping them so they know who they need to go through for approval. If it's an Operational

one, they will be submitted to this Board as well as the Trustees Board for approval. They've created one master location where all the information will be located. If it's a policy that will relate to, say, a Call Taker and Dispatcher, it will go in both sections so that it's easy to refer to. They have also gone to a new number schema; all PD policies will be 5's, Fire related will be 6's, if there is a number assigned, this means that it's an approved and most current policy. If it's a 4-digit number, it's a policy, if it's a 5-digit number, it's a procedure. They will be creating a change form as well so they can insure that if someone wants a policy change, they are following the right steps to do so. They are also putting a change policy in front of the policy manual so that we can watch the progression. The next meeting will be next week and by next month Operations will see a handful of these for approval.

Service Awards

John mentioned that Jeff Monson has been with VECC for 10 years now and presented him with a 10-year award.

9-1-1 Distribution

John quickly mentioned the 9-1-1 Distribution. The official document that went to the State Tax Commission is in the shared Dropbox for review. John put something similar to this together for the Legislature when this was being debated. The new \$0.10 will generate about \$25 million. VECC's share, if looking at the percentage, which is about 30% of calls taken, gives us about \$7.2 million. The trend for 9-1-1 collections had been moving around, and part of this is due to accuracy of the accounting going on with the Tele-communication people. It was put into legislation that now, the State Tax Commission has the obligation and they take more money out of the total fund to audit them, and periodically have them show where this is going to make sure it's going to the right jurisdictions. This is part of the argument used to have a State fund that no longer is distributed based upon a billing address for a cell phone company but so it's based upon call volume. John budgeted \$6.5 million and John doesn't believe that this year we will collect the \$7.2 million. Anytime there has been a change in taxes, it takes probably 4 or 5 months before it's all collected and distributed. The Tax Commission is not going to distribute something that they haven't already collected. Each penny that is collected based on the subscription generates about \$350k into the over-all fund. \$0.71 for us comes out to about \$7.2 million. This is the potential if everything remains the same. SLC is the other beneficiary and they will receive a significant increase as well. One of the areas hit the hardest is Uintah, which is DPS. Everyone will have a 2-year hold harmless, another reason the \$7.2 million will probably be closer to \$6.5 or \$7 million. They will be held harmless for 2 years based on what they received last year. It's not significant enough to impact us to a great degree.

There was nothing further to discuss at the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:39 a.m.